

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1A, 1B, and 1C. This sheet, which includes FIGS. 1A, 1B, and 1C, replaces the original sheet including these FIGS. In FIG. 1A, previously omitted reference numeral 34 has been added. In FIG. 1B, previously omitted reference numerals 29 and 34 have been added. In FIG. 1C, previously omitted reference numeral 34 has been added.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 through 29 were presented for examination in the present application. Claims 14 through 21 have been withdrawn. The instant amendment adds new claim 30. Thus, claims 1 through 13 and 22 through 30 are presented for consideration upon entry of the instant amendment.

Claims 1 through 13 and 22 through 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Independent claim 1 has been amended accordingly. Claims 2 through 13 and 22 through 29 depend from independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 through 13 and 22 through 29 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 11, 22, 23, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,518,168 ("Clem"). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clem, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,683,642 ("Chrissey"). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clem, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,059,258 ("Wefers"). Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clem, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,871,579 ("Liang"). Claims 25, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clem, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,465 ("Hawker"). Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clem, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,115,336 ("Schildkraut").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "depositing a thin film material in liquid solution on a substrate having thereon a patterned underlayer of a self-assembled monolayer having patterned and unpatterned regions; wherein... the patterned thin film is formed **only** on a surface of the substrate not coated with the self-assembled monolayer (emphasis added)".

Clem discloses that “A blocking agent such as a SAM is applied to surfaces serve to control nucleation and adhesion of overlayers of material from a precursor source, such as a CVD environment or a fluid precursor such as a sol-gel. Material from such precursor sources adheres loosely and poorly to the blocking agent, or is formed thereon with poor structural characteristics, and can be removed from the blocking agent easily by thermal and/or mechanical agitation (emphasis added)”. See, col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 3.

In addition, Clem discloses that “A sol-gel precursor then is applied to the surface of the substrate by, for example, dip coating or spin-casting. After heat treatment amorphous oxide 19 forms at regions 22 and adheres well to the substrate, but above regions 20 oxide is poorly adhered and easily removed by thermal and/or mechanical agitation, resulting in the substrate 18 including oxide 19 patterned at portions 22 of the substrate surface, that is, deposited on the substrate surface in a pattern complementary to the SAM pattern (FIG. 1d) (emphasis added)”. See, col. 6, lines 25 – 35.

It is clear, therefore, that in Clem, the material precursor deposits on not only the substrate surface, but also on the blocking agent as well. This is clearly in contrast to claim 1 which requires that “the patterned thin film is formed only on a surface of the substrate not coated with the self-assembled monolayer”.

Clem also discloses that SAM is “a self-assembled monolayer... of a molecular species in a pattern which acts to block chemical vapor deposition (CVD) where the self-assembled monolayer is formed, and exposing the surface to chemical vapor deposition conditions (emphasis added)”. See, col. 2, lines 45 – 48.

Furthermore, the material in Clem is deposited to portions of the substrate free of SAM (self-assembled monolayer) utilizing chemical vapor deposition. Therefore, the material is deposited as a vapor onto the substrate. Once again, this is clearly contrary

to claim 1 which requires "depositing a thin film material in liquid solution on a substrate".

It is clear, therefore, that Clem does not disclose or suggest the elements of claim 1. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the elements of claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2 through 13 and 22 through 29 depend from independent claim 1 and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1 through 13 and 22 through 29 are respectfully requested.

In addition, because claim 1 has been indicated as being generic, and because withdrawn claims 14 through 21 depend from independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder and allowance of claims 14 through 21.

Claim 30 has been added to point out various aspects of the present application. It is submitted that new claim 30 is directed to the elected embodiment. Support for new claim 30 can be found in the specification at least in original claim 1.

Applicants specifically point out that new claim 30 is intended to no longer be limited to the specific mechanisms of patentability previously argued with respect to any prior claims in this or any related applications. Accordingly, Applicants hereby rescind any disclaimer of claim scope and, thus, any prior art for which such a disclaimer was made to avoid may need to be revisited by the Examiner with respect to new claim 30.


It is believed that new claim 30 is in a condition for allowance. For example, claim 30 recites applying a thin film material in liquid solution to the surface of the substrate which is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/4, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul D. Greeley  
Registration No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401